REMARKS

The drawings were objected to by the Examiner for not designating FIGS. 6 and 7 as –Prior Art--.

By this amendment FIGS. 6 and 7 have been corrected to designate them as –Prior Art--. Approval by the Examiner of the changes to the drawings is respectfully requested. Formal drawings incorporating the changes are also submitted herewith under separate letter to the draftsperson.

The Examiner has objected to the specification stating that the acronym "TIRF" was first mentioned on page 10 of the specification without reference as to what it means.

Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to page 7, line 10, wherein it first mentions the definition of "TIRF" as "a total-internal reflection-frustrater (TIRF)". Therefore, this objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 21, 22, and 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as their invention.

Claim 19 has been amended to depend from claim 3. Therefore, claim 21 now has a sufficient antecedent basis. Claim 22 also now has an antecedent basis for the term semi-transparent electrode. Claims 27-30 now depend on claim 19 and they also have sufficient antecedent basis.

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 15-22, and 27-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakayama et al. (US Pat. No. 5,847,506) in view of Dodabalapur et al. (US Pat. No. 5,814,416).

The present invention will now be reviewed with respect to claim 1 which is now the only independent claim present in this application. Claim 1 defines a white light emitting OLED having a microcavity. The microcavity is configured to have an angular-dependent narrow-band emission which is not desirable in a white light structure. The light-integrating element integrates the angular dependent narrow-band emission to form white light. So in this arrangement, the internal light produced is not white light but it is acted on by the light-integrated element so that the apparatus produces white light.

Neither Nakayama et al. or Dodabalapur et al. describe an OLED device that has at its output white light. This will be discussed hereinafter.

Nakayama et al. discloses an OLED device having a microcavity structure which will produce a narrow band emission of light at its output. See col. 4, lines 51-64. The Examiner's position is that element 2 is an integrating element. Element 2 as described in col. 4, lines 55-58 is a semi-transparent reflective film and is not and integrating element which takes a narrow emission beam and forms white light. The Nakayama et al. device does not produce white light and the microcavity is tuned to produce a particular color light in a way well understood in the art.

Dodabalapur et al. discloses a microcavity structure which internally produces light. A filter layer of appropriate thickness can be incorporated in the microcavity structure to control the emitted wavelength as stated in col. 1, lines 57-61. "By using different thicknesses for the filter layer in distinct regions of a planar microcavity structure, a single emissive layer of organic material can be used to construct red, green or blue light emitting elements in the distinct regions." Clearly, the output of Dodabalapur et al. is not white light. Dodabalapur et al. uses a non-planar service structure to reduce wavelength variations in the emitted output color light. This is shown in Fig. 6 of Dodabalapur et al. The non-planar structures are shown for example in Figs. 7-9 of Dodabalapur et al. Assuming the non-planar surface provides an integrating surface, it is not for the purpose of producing white light as performed by the integrating element of claim 1 of the present invention.

Clearly, neither Nakayama et al. or Dodabalapur et al. are even directed to the problem of outputting white light. They are concerned with producing specific colors and either tuning or providing filter elements to produce the desired color. Therefore, applicants believe that neither of these references, taken singly or in combination provides any motivation for the present invention.

It is believed that these changes now make the claims clear and definite and, if there are any problems with these changes, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 22,363

Raymond L. Owens/djw
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-4653
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.

Amendments to the Drawings:

Replacement sheets for FIGS. 1-8 are enclosed which formalize the drawings that were submitted with the application. The enclosed sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 6 and 7 (FIGS. 6 and 7). These sheets replace the original Figures 6 and 7. Approval by the Examiner is respectfully requested.